

S DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Address:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/077,914 06/04/98 DIETRICH k. M04805LEA314 **EXAMINER** IM62/0915 PATENT DEPARTMENT. FOELAK, M BAYER CORPORATION **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER 100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH PA 15205-9741 1711 DATE MAILED: 09/15/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No. 09/077,914 Approant(s)

Dietrich et al

Examiner

Morton Foelak

Group Art Unit 1711



	E PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]	
	a) X expires3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
	expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.	
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.	
	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).	
	licant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Aug 24, 1999</u> has been considered with the following effect, is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:	
	The proposed amendment(s):	
	will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.	
	will not be entered because:	
	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).	
1	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).	
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.	
	\square they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
	NOTE:	
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.	
	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The condition of the condition of the claimed combination of polyol, blowing agent and co-blowing agent and co-blowing agent and co-blowing agent and co-blowing agent	_
□ ⊠	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:	_
	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: no criticality has been shown in the use of the claimed combination of polyol, blowing agent and co-blowing agent which have been shown to be old in the art.even in light of De Vos et al's disclosure of these ingredients. See (other) The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by	_
	Separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: no criticality has been shown in the use of the claimed combination of polyol, blowing agent and co-blowing agent which have been shown to be old in the art.even in light of De Vos et al's disclosure of these ingredients. See (other) The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised be the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):	_
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition allowance because: no criticality has been shown in the use of the claimed combination of polyol, blowing agent and co-blowing agent which have been shown to be old in the art.even in light of De Vos et al's disclosure of these ingredients. See (other) The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised be the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed:	_
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: no criticality has been shown in the use of the claimed combination of polyol, blowing agent and co-blowing agent which have been shown to be old in the art.even in light of De Vos et al's disclosure of these ingredients. See (other) The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised be the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to:	_
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition allowance because: no criticality has been shown in the use of the claimed combination of polyol, blowing agent and co-blowing agent which have been shown to be old in the art.even in light of De Vos et al's disclosure of these ingredients. See (other) The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised be the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed:	_
□ X I	Separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition of allowance because: **no criticality has been shown in the use of the claimed combination of polyol, blowing agent and co-blowing agent which have been shown to be old in the art.even in light of De Vos et al's disclosure of these ingredients. See (other) The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised be the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims rejected: 11-15 and 18-23.	_

ART UNIT 1711